

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 458

CG 014 993

AUTHOR McDonald, Gerald W.: Osmond, Marie Withers
 TITLE Jealousy and Trust: Unexplored Dimensions of Social Exchange Dynamics.
 PUB DATE 21 Oct 80
 NOTE 21p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (Portland, OR, October 22-25, 1980).
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior: Affective Measures: Emotional Response: *Interpersonal Relationship: *Marriage: Marriage Counseling: Models: *Social Exchange Theory: *Spouses: State of the Art Reviews
 IDENTIFIERS *Jealousy: *Trust

ABSTRACT

Little effort has been made to systematically assess the determinants and consequences of marital jealousy which affect marital, familial and extra-familial expectations, interactions and behavior. A preliminary attempt to rectify this omission provides a conceptual/theoretical perspective on jealousy dynamics in marriage. Marital jealousy, a perceptual phenomenon, refers to the perceived threat of diminution or loss of the valued resources of the spouse and is distinguishable from envy. An analysis of a jealous situation should include descriptions of the normative orientation, the exchange dynamics, the development of competition, and the two major dimensions of marital jealousy, i.e., power and esteem. Four types of jealousy exist in marital situations: possession, fear, ideal-self- and exclusion jealousy. Some solutions to marital jealousy include increasing the mutual commitment of the partners and developing mutual trust in the relationship. (Author/KMF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED198458

JEALOUSY AND TRUST: UNEXPLORED DIMENSIONS
OF SOCIAL EXCHANGE DYNAMICS*

Gerald W. McDonald

Marie Withers Osmond

Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

* A Paper prepared for presentation at the NCFR Pre-Conference Workshop on
Theory Construction and Research Methodology in Portland, Oregon on
October 21, 1980.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald W. McDonald

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

CG 014993

The feeling of jealousy is one of the most common emotions in intimate male-female relationships in our society. Similarly, the actual or potential consequences of this emotion for the couple's interaction patterns and general relationship style is one of the most basic aspects of developing or stable intimate relationships. Surprisingly, however, there has been little systematic exploration of jealousy in dating and marital relationships thus far in the marriage and family literature. In fact, an examination of texts in marriage and family sociology indicates that we seem to be operating under the pretense that jealousy does not exist, much like those of the Victorian era pretended that sex did not exist. Those authors who do allude to jealousy in relationships generally do so by initially referring to the "popular" conception of jealousy as being a measure of one's love for the other. However, these discussions often tend to characterize jealousy in relationships as reflecting immaturity which healthy individuals and relationships outgrow. In this regard, the O'Neills' (1972) are often referenced as the authorities who have recognized jealousy to be a "destructive cancer" in intimate relationships. However, jealousy in some form or other seems to be universal cross-culturally and as such is in need of systematic exploration in the area of marriage and the family.

Perhaps this neglect of the study of jealousy has resulted partially from the evasiveness of the concept, similar to the concept of "love," or it may be that the construct of "jealousy" has more routinely been viewed as a psychological phenomenon and, as such, has not been seen as central to an understanding of the sociological and social psychological dynamics of male-female interaction. However, we feel that jealousy is an interactional, rather than an exclusively psychological, concept and thus needs more careful examination. This paper takes this approach to the study of jealousy and, more specifically, it attempts to demonstrate in an exploratory manner the "goodness of fit" of social exchange theory for increasing our theoretical understanding of jealousy as a major component of male-female relationships. In addition, this paper will attempt to advance the beginnings of a theoretical model of marital jealousy which, with further conceptual refinement, will hopefully contribute to our understanding of the dynamics of jealousy in marriage at the theoretical and empirical levels.

Jealousy: Alternative Conceptualizations

As previously observed, most definitions of jealousy have indicated it to be a psychological emotion with varying degrees of inherent and learned qualities. In the few writings on jealousy, a number of orientations have been presented. These include: (1) An instinctual approach to jealousy which argues that jealousy is part of "human nature" and that, in male-female relations, monogamous marriage is a product of this jealousy (Darwin, 1888; Westermarck, 1922). However, cross-cultural evidence of polygamous societies, for instance, has tended to refute this notion; (2) A functional approach which posits that jealousy is a product of monogamy and functions to maintain monogamy as a cultural "cornerstone" (Davis, 1936); (3) A labeling approach arguing that societal beliefs about what emotions are appropriate in various

settings serve to provide a labeling of jealousy as the feeling-state one is experiencing when physiological arousal occurs (Schachter, 1964; Walster and Walster, 1977). These latter two explanations have served to demonstrate the sociological nature of jealousy in recognizing the role of cultural expectations and normative definitions in the experience of jealousy. In this sense, Bernard (1977) has stated that: "The orchestration of the emotions of a people can ordinarily be seen as part of a total institutional system... Emotions become, in effect, institutionalized. We learn when to express them and when not to - and also how to do so" (p.144).

The Sociological Domain of Jealousy.

The first sociological discussion of jealousy was by Kingsley Davis (1936) in his essay entitled "Jealousy and Sexual Property." Davis provided a functionalist explanation and defined jealousy as a "fear or rage reaction to a threatened appropriation of one's own, or what is desired as one's own property" (p. 395).

Congruent with social exchange theory, the argument is effectively made that an affectionate relationship between two persons can be conceived of as a property relationship and four elements are necessary for inclusion in studying conflicts over property: (1) owner; (2) object; (3) public; and (4) rival or trespasser. The normative component of jealousy is explicated within the four elements and Davis (1936:395) states, in this regard: "A popular fallacy has been to conceive the jealous situation as a triangle. Actually it is a quadrangle and the failure to include the public or community element has led to a failure to grasp the social character of jealousy. The relationships between the four elements are institutionally defined. They constitute the fixed traditional constellation of rights, obligations and neutralities called property and are sustained by interacting attitudes."

On the one hand, then, jealousy can be viewed as arising from a legitimate competition for desired property, with a felt danger of superior rivalry. This would be characteristic of jealousy in dating relationships. Though the cultural definition of the appropriateness of such competition might vary depending on the stage of the dating relationship, it is generally considered legitimate to compete, as a rival, with another person of the same sex for the "hand" of a person desired by both. The person, or "object," of the competition is then in the position to take the "best possible deal."

Jealousy can also be considered to be a reaction to the threat of illegitimate loss of property by a "trespasser." This would most appropriately characterize marital jealousy. In this case, the spouse is considered to be "property" which one has fairly obtained through the competitive process of mate-selection and any attempts to intrude on that "propertied relationship" are illegitimate and are sufficient justification for the arousal of jealousy.

In both cases, from a social exchange perspective, jealousy can be seen to arise in perceived competitive situations where such competition is viewed as restricting rewards and increasing costs in relationships and affecting one or both partners comparison level alternatives. The dynamics of jealousy appear basically the same in the threatening encounters by "rivals" and "trespassers." Our focus in this paper will be restricted, however, to marital

jealousy in which the person already "possesses" the desired "property," i.e., the spouse, and feels threatened by the possible loss of the spouse and the resources that he/she provides. Thus, marital jealousy may be viewed as the perceived threat of diminution or loss of the valued resources of the spouse. These valued resources may be both tangible and intangible in nature, including attention and affectionate interaction, sexual exclusivity, time spent in the relationship, the adequate performance of family roles, as well as more economic-based resources such as income and standard-of-living. Relatedly, the threat of the trespasser may include the spouse's potential or actual access to alternative resources from those that the jealous spouse has to provide and may, thus, present the threat of the diminution of loss of those "traditionally-valued" resources that that spouse can provide to the other.

Jealousy, then, refers to the perceived threat of lessened access to the valued resources of the spouse and/or the perceived threat of the devaluation of one's own resources by the spouse. It should be noted that jealousy is defined as a perceptual phenomenon initially in that it is unimportant at the outset whether the threat is, in fact, real or not. The feeling of jealousy is governed by one's perception of a competitor or "trespasser." The positive sanctioning of jealousy by the "community," or one's reference group, however, may be largely determined by whether the threat is considered real, and a legitimate cause for worry. To the extent that the person appears to be "worried about nothing" or being "overly possessive" from the perspective of the person's friends, relatives, and other associates, expression of jealousy is negatively sanctioned and, over time, the expression of feelings of jealousy to others may become extinguished. However, the actual existence of a threat does become important in the behavioral consequences of jealousy. The interactional dynamics of jealousy involve not only the jealous partner, but also the spouse and, perhaps, the "trespasser" also, should the trespasser be another person. Thus, the shared reality of the "jealous situation" is important for the exchange and negotiation processes occurring as a result of the feeling of jealousy. The concern for this shared reality of all those involved in the jealous situation requires that a distinction be made between jealousy and envy.

Jealousy and Envy.

In order to clearly delineate the concept of jealousy it is necessary to distinguish it from the concept of "envy." Though often used synonymously, jealousy and envy are distinct emotions. This has been observed by Sullivan (1953), Simmel (quoted in Schoeck, 1969), Schoeck (1969) and Foster (1972). Perhaps, Foster has provided one of the best distinctions. He states that "...they refer to distinct aspects of what may be called a social (and emotional) state, act, or condition....Envy stems from the desire to acquire something possessed by another person, while jealousy is rooted in the fear of losing something already possessed" (Foster, 1972:167,168). He further indicates that both involve a dyad (at the minimum) whose relationship is "mediated or structured by an intervening property or object" (p. 168). This intervening property or object may be tangible or intangible but, in any case, it is possessed by one person and desired by the other. Thus, the person not

in possession may be envious of the other for that which is possessed. However, should the person possessing the object perceive the other's envy as a threat, then that person may become jealous. In this regard, it is generally agreed, that a major distinction between jealousy and envy is that envy is directed toward the person in possession, and not the object, whereas jealousy is focused on the valued possession. Foster (1972:168) observes: "Perhaps the primary distinction between envy and jealousy can be made by suggesting that a man may be envious of another man for his beautiful wife (he desires, but does not envy, the wife), but the husband is jealous of his wife as he fears she may leave him. Jealousy is thus seen to be the normal counterpart of envy, something that is triggered when the envied perceives, or becomes conscious of, the envy, and views it as a significant threat." To the extent, then, that the perceived threat by the jealous person is justified, it can be argued that jealousy and envy serve as complementary emotions in the situation.

Types of Marital Jealousy

Although the arousal of marital jealousy can generally be described, as previously demonstrated, by reference to the threatened diminution or loss of the resources of spouse or self, jealousy cannot be considered a unidimensional phenomenon. Jealousy is differentiated, in particular, by: (1) the nature of the threatening object, or trespasser, (2) the form in which the resources are perceived as in jeopardy, or the nature of the threat itself; and, (3) the nature of the emotion aroused by the perceived threat.

The trespasser to one's legitimately held "property," may be person or object, tangible or intangible. Sexual jealousy is, perhaps, most often thought of when jealousy is discussed. This, of course, involves the perceived competition with another person of one's own sex for one's spouse. However, such competition may also occur with another person in a non-sexual context, such as the spouse's friends, family or colleagues. Often, a husband experiences jealousy of a new child as the wife shifts her attention from the husband to the baby. Regarding intangibles, a spouse may be threatened by the competition felt from the marital partner's extra-familial involvement such as work/career commitments, educational commitments, etc. In addition, jealousy may be aroused because of the feeling that not enough time is being spent together. Mazur (1977) has characterized these as person jealousy, opportunity/situation jealousy, and time jealousy, respectively.

Mazur (1977) has also characterized several types of jealousy which relate to the nature of the perceived threat by the individual. These include: (1) possessive jealousy, which can be seen as the extreme orientation of spouse as property such that the spouse is seen only as an extension of self with little or no recognition of his or her individual autonomy; (2) exclusion jealousy, which involves the feeling of being left out of the enjoyable experiences of the other; (3) competition jealousy, which occurs as a result of jealousy of the achievements of the spouse and generates competition for equal recognition and success; (4) egotism jealousy, which involves the attempt to deny any freedom from role stereotypes and, in this sense, is closely related to possessive jealousy; and (5) fear jealousy, which is bred by low

self-esteem and involves the basic fear of being rejected by the other. Though other typologies could be generated, this model is illustrative of the differing "motivations" from which jealousy emerges. Clanton and Smith (1977), for instance, argue that a particular experience of jealousy comes either from feeling excluded or from a fear of loss. This fits well into our guiding definition of jealousy with feeling of exclusion relating to the threat of devaluation of one's own resources by the spouse, and fear of loss being congruent with the threat of diminution of loss of the valued resources of the spouse.

Lastly, differing types of jealousy evoke differing forms of emotions. For instance, Mazur characterizes possessive jealousy as evoking a rageful reaction while exclusion jealousy is the most painful and, perhaps, most depressing type of reaction. The specific delineation of these differing reactions will be elaborated in the last section of this paper. However, it is important to note that the processes of marital jealousy are dynamic and multidimensional and further theoretical and empirical progress in this research area will require a systematic recognition and delineation of these categories.

Marital Jealousy and Social Exchange

To view marital jealousy as an individual emotion governed by normative expectations and manifesting itself in the interactional processes and patterns within the marital dyad, clearly establishes the legitimacy of investigating jealousy within a social exchange framework. In fact, the early heuristic analysis of jealousy by Kingsley Davis (1936) parallels quite closely the traditional "marketplace" analogy of social exchange theory. The basic premise of social exchange theory, that individuals in social interaction attempt to maximize rewards and minimize costs to obtain the most profitable outcomes, has been employed to explain and predict a wide range of social behavior. The general tenets of social exchange theory were initially posited by Homans (1958, 1961), Thibaut and Kelley (1959) and Blau (1964). Major reviews and critiques of social exchange theory have been presented more recently by Simpson (1972), Ekeh (1974), Emerson (1976), Chadwick-Jones (1976) and Gergen (1980). The applicability of social exchange for marriage and family research has been demonstrated by Edwards (1969), Broderick (1971), Scanzoni (1972), Murstein (1973) and Nye (1978). These discussions provide the systematic presentations of social exchange concepts and propositions which have applicability for more fully understanding the jealousy phenomenon.

It has recently been argued (McDonald, 1978), however, that exchange theory needs to be broadened considerably to be able to more adequately explain the dynamics of social behavior in such a unique social arrangement as marriage. The uniqueness of the marital relationship rests on the nature of marriage, which generally has a lengthy temporal duration and evidences structural and normative constraints, resulting in differential role expectations and obligations of the marital partners, an unequal distribution of resources and, thus, an asymmetrical exchange context. Further, this exchange context in marriage is more often cooperative, rather than competitive in nature, and as such is

strongly influenced by the commitment and trust that the partners may develop toward each other over the length of the marriage.

From this perspective, the necessary elements to be included in jealousy situations, as characterized by Davis (1936), and applied to marital jealousy specifically, may be redefined from a "structural exchange" framework, to include the following: (1) the internalized normative expectations regarding the nature of the relationship, including the interactional exchange process, the legitimate/illegitimate domains of jealousy, and especially as it defines the power/dependence relationship and definitions of exclusivity; (2) the exchange dynamics of the two persons in the intimate relationship, and most notably as they are affected by commitment and trust; and, (3) the development of competition in the relationship upon the intrusion of a trespasser and the resultant influence on the nature of rewards, costs and outcomes in the exchange relationship and particularly as it affects the comparison level and comparison level of alternatives for both partners.

Normative Orientation

Marital relationships in our society involve culturally internalized expectations of the nature of marriage relationships generally and, more specifically, include the normatively perceived expectations and obligations in the husband and wife roles. The legitimation of jealousy has traditionally been inherent in these expectations. Particularly in American society with its strong capitalistic nature, the resulting emphasis on private property and ownership has encompassed orientations toward marital relationships. One's spouse is viewed as one's property and any encroachment on that property by a trespasser is seen as a legitimate basis for the development of jealousy. Only when the perceived threat is seen as irrational from the societal, or one's reference group, perspective, is jealousy seen as being illegitimate.

Though practically all discussions of jealousy place its early development within sibling relationships, early discussions of jealousy in the social science literature generally referred to male jealousy of the female (e.g., Davis, 1936). As Bernard (1977) has observed, for instance, since sexual exclusivity was apparently not a right traditionally given to women, there was thought to be no need for female sexual jealousy to enforce it. However, it may be that no behavioral manifestations were evident, though resources were perhaps threatened, because of the powerlessness and extreme dependence of the wife on the husband. However, more recent arguments (e.g., Veerhusen and Krain, 1980) have taken the position that the female is more jealous than the male because of gender-role socialization into female insecurity. Though Veerhusen and Krain found no support for this hypothesis, it should be noted that their research focused on jealousy in dating relationships rather than in marriage. No research efforts have systematically tested this latter hypothesis.

From an exchange perspective, the male would, perhaps, be jealous because the wife has traditionally been explicitly defined as property and, as such, was assumed to be under the direct control of the husband. Any encroachment on that "property," whether highly valued property or not, is considered

threatening and even rageful. Perhaps, this operates as a classic statement of the traditional double-standard, both sexually and otherwise. Though the husband has more possible or real options (comparison level alternatives) than the wife, he protects his property. Traditionally, it would seem that the wife has had more of a "right" to be jealous, in the real sense that there are more threats to the loss of property. She has been more dependent than the male, in having fewer viable alternatives and, thus, has had to more realistically fear the loss of those potential resources, tangible and intangible, of the husband. However, many husbands would, in fact, react strongly to the notion of their wives viewing them as "their property," as they would view their wives.

Consideration should also be given to the normatively sanctioned differentials which male and female internalize with respect to openly expressing emotions, both positive and negative in nature. Current notions of greater female jealousy may be partially explained by the female's greater willingness to express her jealousy to her husband, whereas the "inexpressive" husband has more difficulty admitting the threat, and thus may either sublimate his feelings or deny them. At any rate, it is necessary to examine closely those internalized normative orientations toward jealousy in marriage as they vary by gender, social class, race, ethnicity, etc., as we attempt to systematically explore the dynamics of marital jealousy.

Exchange Dynamics

The normative orientation of males and females entering into a marital relationship has direct implications for the social exchange relationship patternings which characterize their marital role interaction. This is the case for the expression of feelings of jealousy also and the manner in which jealousy arises and is dealt with in the marriage. At least three aspects of the structural exchange dynamics of marriage need discussion with regard to jealousy.

First, marriage has been, and continues to be, characterized by asymmetrical, or imbalanced, power/dependence relationships. Though we are witnessing a decrease in such asymmetry in many modern marriages, largely as a result of females gaining more access to valued resources, at the most, we typically have the wife's role at present as "junior partner" (Scanzoni, 1972). As a result, females in marriage tend to be more dependent on the resources of the husband, than the husband is on the wife. Considering the earlier definition of jealousy as perceived threat of loss of resources provided by the spouse, it could be argued that the feeling and expression of jealousy is more prevalent for the female. However, as women gain more of the valued resources, perhaps largely economic in nature, and as such power contributes to the continued demise of the double standard, the experience of jealousy should become more similar, or symmetrical, for both husbands and wives. In addition, it might be expected that marital partners will more explicitly negotiate their own "exchange rules" (Cook, 1975) regarding the standards of conduct necessary to circumvent feelings of jealousy and conflict resolution techniques for the handling of jealousy when it arises. Bernard (1977) has argued that jealousy is becoming less prevalent as a result of the dissolution of strong normative standards for exclusivity, sexual and otherwise, in marriage. However, it may well be that jealousy will not diminish per se, but will in fact take differing forms as

societal norms for marital interaction and exchange become redefined. To the degree, then, that power/dependence relationships shift and transform themselves in marriage, the dynamics of marital jealousy can also be expected to change in nature.

A second aspect of marital exchange relates to this power/dependence shift. As females in marriage gain access to valued resources, and thus become less dependent on the male, the stability of marital relationships could be expected to be governed less by the lack of available alternatives and governed more by the voluntary commitment of the marital partners to each other and to the maintenance of the marriage. Marriage, then, perhaps becomes more of a negotiated order with mutually agreed upon consistency of behavior of each spouse toward the other (as a definition of commitment) coming through mutual understanding and through cooperative arrangement to maximize their joint profits (Scanzoni, 1979) in the relationship. Thus, voluntary commitment to the relationship may increasingly substitute for dependence on the resources of the other. The degree to which that consistent, "committed" behavior toward the spouse is forthcoming serves to increase the level of trust in the marital partner. Trust, then, becomes a third major aspect of marital exchange.

From an exchange framework, commitment can be viewed as the willingness to, and consistent providing or sharing of, one's valued resources with the other. As such, commitment can be viewed as a function of power; that is, the power to be able to provide and share those resources in a predictable manner. Trust, then, becomes the degree to which one can rely on those resources of the spouse to be provided in the future. As will be developed later, the development of trust has to do with one's past exchange experiences, both in and outside of the marriage, and esteem the individual has, or the degree to which one is able to rely on his or her own judgment of what to expect out of the relationship's exchange patterning. Mazur (1977), for instance, has characterized possessive jealousy as being commitment without trust. However, possessive jealousy could also include dependency without trust. In this context, lack of trust would seem to be a necessary condition for the arousal of jealousy in marriage.

The Development of Competition

The arousal of jealousy in marriage results from the perceived threat of direct competition for the valued resources of the spouse, or the availability of alternatively accessible resources previously provided to the spouse by the jealous partner. Since marital exchange is usually characterized by cooperative exchange relations as a result of commitment and trust, the threat of competition for resource supply and demand shifts the exchange relationship toward a more self-interest type of exchange, or bargaining, strategy. This shift relates directly to the levels of commitment and trust in the marital relationship. The following section of this paper attempts to present, in an exploratory and illustrative fashion, an exchange-based model of marital jealousy.

Toward A Model of Marital Jealousy

This structural exchange orientation to marital jealousy has hopefully demonstrated the relationship of jealousy dynamics in marriage to commitment and trust in the marital relationship. As earlier observed, marital commitment was argued to be power-based and trust to be esteem-based in the marital dyad. These two dimensions of "power" and "esteem" appear to be consistently implied in the definitions of jealousy offered earlier by social scientists and can be seen to also be embedded in the working definition of marital jealousy in this paper. The dimensions of power and esteem will thus be used to guide the discussion of our model of marital jealousy.

Power and Esteem Dimensions of Marital Jealousy

A number of authors have focused on the power dimension of jealousy. Davis (1936), in his classic article on jealousy and sexual property, emphasized that males are socialized to expect "exclusive rights" to the attention and sex of a spouse. Whitehurst (1977) underscored the competitive aspect of jealousy and traced this to American ideology. Ellis (1977), similarly, focused on the possessiveness of the jealous, male partner. May (1972:117) stated directly that "jealousy characterizes the relationship in which one seeks more power than love."

Other authors have given more attention to what we consider to be the esteem dimension of jealousy. Mead (1977), for example, declared that "jealousy records the degree of the lover's insecurity." Lobsenz (1977) emphasized self-doubt, lack of self-esteem, and feelings of inadequacy as major components of jealousy. Bernard (1977) made the distinction that while the stimulus for male jealousy was often sexual in nature, the stimuli for female jealousy are "fear and anxiety."

The definition of jealousy in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary again appears to reflect the two dimensions: (1) exacting exclusive devotion; intolerant of rivalry; (2) fearful, distrustful, suspiciously watchful. In essence, then, there appears to be general support for analyzing jealousy in, at least, two dimensions: (1) Power - the component of jealousy have to do with possession, competition, and exclusivity; and (2) Esteem - the component of jealousy that contains fear, insecurity, and feelings of self-inadequacy.

Recently, Kemper (1978b) introduced a model of social relations that appears directly pertinent to our dimensional analysis of marital jealousy. Kemper's (1978b:32) major premise was that "an extremely large class of human emotions results from real, anticipated, imagined or recollected outcomes of social relationships." In the analysis of basic dimensions of relational behavior, Kemper noted (as have others) that two relational factors generally have emerged. These two factors, or dimensions, have been variously labeled: e.g., Borgatta, (1964) called them "assertiveness and likeability;" Schutz (1958) as well as Lorr and McNair (1963) labeled them "control and affection." Kemper (1973, 1978a, 1978b) labeled these two dimensions "power and the giving of status." According to Kemper (1978b:32) "the power dimension of relationship encompasses such acts as coercing, forcing, threatening, punishing, dominating,

and so on." Kemper's status dimension, on the other hand, refers to the "voluntary, uncoerced giving of benefits, rewards, and privileges." Kemper, then, introduces a model that delineates the degree of power and status in a dyadic relationship and the agent or actor's sense of who is responsible for the excess or deficit of power and/or status. Figure 1 offers the basic outline of Kemper's model.

Figure 1 about here

The model in Figure 1 portrays the actor's (not the other's) perception of the relationship. Kemper (1978b:33) illustrated the heuristic nature of the model in analyzing the emotions of guilt (as a consequence of the actor's felt excess or deficit of power) versus shame (as a consequence of the actor's felt excess or deficit of status). We believe that the model, with some modification, is also useful in explicating the emotional cognates of jealousy in a marital relationship.

Marital Jealousy: A Model

Initially, certain basic assumptions must be clarified. In attempting to elaborate a sociological explanation of emotional states, we must focus on social context. In contrast, a psychological approach (which may be necessary but is rarely sufficient to explain emotions) concentrates on individual behavior. A sociological approach necessitates an examination of the social-historical context in which behavior is produced. Emotions are socially constructed according to cultural rules (Hochschild, 1975; Averill, 1976; Schott, 1977). These rules vary across social class and historically. In essence, if we are to analyze variations in power and status in marital relationships in American society in the late 1900's, we must recognize initially that the particular context is one in which there is: (1) a complex stratification system with a cultural ethos of male superiority which is reflected in (2) social rules, one of the most basic being gender roles, and which is (3) institutionalized in marriage with a traditional, patriarchal authority structure. Thus, while our substantive focus is on situational conflict that may produce various emotional cognates of jealousy, we explicitly recognize that these conflicts take place in a marital structure where resources of power and esteem are normatively gender differentiated. Finally, we do not assume that jealousy is universally present in all marriages. We do assume that, given certain imbalances in power and/or status, plus certain situational contexts, the emotion cognates of jealousy are highly predictable.

The model explored here is shown in Figure 2. The two major dimensions of jealousy are labeled "power" and "esteem." Power is defined, following Kemper (1978b), as control or the taking of benefits from another who does not confer them willingly. The second dimension is labeled "esteem," rather than Kemper's "status," because it appears more accurately to connote the voluntary giving of affect and benefits in a marital relationship (and it subsumes the "affection" factor noted by others). The relational matrix presented in Figure 2, contains four major cells delineated by the power-esteem axis and the excess-deficit axis. Each of these cells is dichotomized as to whether self or other is perceived, by the actor, as the responsible agent. We then propose

a major emotional cognate of jealousy for each of these eight relational conditions. Each cell is discussed in numerical order and illustrations are offered of situational contexts.

Figure 2 about here

Cell I depicts that Actor (A) perceives that an excess of power/control tactics was used/threatened/potential against Spouse (S). This represents the classic situation of male, possessive jealousy.

If the excess use of power is attributed to self (as agency), the emotional cognate may be that of guilt. For example: "When her old boyfriend, Joe, drove her home, I cussed her out and demanded that she never see him again. I feel guilty and sorry. Maybe I ought to make it up to her - do something special for her."

If the excess use of power is attributed to other, "A" is more likely to feel self-righteous blame. This situation is more typical of males who, because of the normative imbalance of power in marriage, expect exclusive rights to the spouse's attention, time, sex, etc. For example: "Jill wants to get a job and I forced her to see how stupid that is. The blow-up was her fault. I feel done in or wronged in some way."

Cell II represents "A" perceiving that an excess of esteem was claimed and/or obtained from "S." This is an intriguing situation for analysis because it deals directly with self-image, self-esteem, and the processes by which one maintains or loses "face" in a relational situation (cf. Ho, 1976, on the concept of face).

If the excess of esteem is attributed to self, the emotional cognate may be one of shame or embarrassment or threatened self-image. For example: "I've always shot Jill the line that I'm extremely competent socially - in fact that people find me almost irresistible - and it's impressed her. But now, we're invited to the most exclusive club in town (whose members are admittedly attractive and talented) and I feel inadequate and I'm afraid of being shown-up and I feel my image with Jill is threatened."

If other is held responsible for giving excess (undeserved) esteem, then the potential arises that other could also take it away and the emotional cognate is more likely to be resentment. For example: "I'm a big guy and Jill's always telling me what a real jock I am, but then, in front of me, she deliberately tells her old boyfriend that I can't hit a ball as far as our six-year-old. I feel defensive and really critical in return. Anyway, if I don't deserve building up, neither does she! Why isn't she a real wife/lover/etc.?"

Cell III depicts "A" as perceiving a deficit of power in the relational context. This represents the classic situation of female jealousy stemming from dependency with consequent insecurity and self-doubt.

If self is attributed responsibility for the lack of power/control, the focus is likely to be on self-inadequacies and the emotional cognate may be one

of anxiety. For example: "There must be something wrong with me that Jack prefers other women. But I can't get along without him. I can't do anything. I'm scared!"

If other is perceived as responsible for "A"'s lack of power, the emotion evoked may be one of rebellion in response to feeling manipulated or "used." "A" may feel competitive in the sense of "I'll show you." For example: "Jack forced me to have this party and now he insists that I do all the hosting while he goes after every woman in sight. I feel used and I think I'll do a little flirting with Al."

Cell IV represents "A" perceiving a deficit of esteem in the relational situation. Again, this is more likely to be characteristic of females who have been normatively expected to seek/find their major source of esteem within the family. The deficit of esteem can range, in degree, from periodic deprivation of affection/gratification/ rewards to actual rejection of the partner.

If self is held responsible for the deprivation of esteem, the emotions evoked are likely to be those characteristic of the classic feelings of depression: i.e., despair, worthlessness, hopelessness, etc. For example: "I don't deserve Jack's or anyone's love. He despises me. The kids don't like me. I'm of no use to anyone and I could just die."

If other is attributed the responsibility for "A"'s deficit in esteem, the emotional reaction is more likely to be one of hostility. In essence, "A" feels deprived or excluded from esteem/affection that appears to "A" to be deserved. The hostility can range from slight irritation to violent anger against the spouse who is perceived as withholding rewards. For example: "Jill hasn't had sex with me in two weeks and Joe just told me that she had a three-hour lunch at a secluded restaurant with her boss today. How can she do this to me? I'm furious!"

In sum, the model in Figure 2 allows a wide variety of analyses that are only touched on in this paper. One could illustrate each cell, for instance, in terms of male as well as female perceptions to emphasize the normative context of emotional states (sex differences in labeling emotional experiences and/or in expressing various emotions). One could also analyze, over time, the effects of social change (such as the women's movement) on the emotional cognates of jealousy. Obviously, the emotional cognates, shown in Figure 2, are not exhaustive nor are they mutually exclusive. Spousal relations, we argue, are composed of both power and esteem dimensions and a breakdown in one is likely to lead to problems with the other. Likewise, an initial anxiety may lead to depression, blame may lead to hostility, etc.

To conclude this section, we take the liberty of several conceptual leaps. First, it appears that the model in Figure 2 offers the possibility of a typology of jealousy. In essence, it is possible to delineate at least four major types of jealousy. We could label these as follows: Cell I as Possession Jealousy; Cell II as Fear Jealousy; Cell III as Ideal-Self Jealousy; and Cell IV as Exclusion Jealousy. These could be compared with Mazur's five types of

of jealousy discussed earlier in this paper.

Second, in linking this conceptualization with earlier theorizing on spousal relations, it appears that imbalances in the power dimension can be made equitable or even equal through the process of increasing the mutual commitment of the partners. This would diminish the probability of both Possession and Fear Jealousy. Similarly, imbalances in the esteem dimension can be rectified through the process of developing mutual trust in the relationship. Thus, Ideal-Self and Exclusion Jealousy would be less predictable. This is not to imply that jealousy can be eliminated in spousal relations. However, a more specific understanding of the social contexts of jealousy could trigger responses that relate positively (e.g., efforts toward self-awareness and improvement) rather than destructively to the relationship.

Measurement: A Concluding Note

It is appropriate, at this point, to make a few comments about strategies for testing this theoretical model of marital jealousy once it is sufficiently elaborated and refined. Additionally, the measurement of jealousy in general needs to be addressed, if only briefly.

A major problem with developing an adequate measure of marital jealousy involves the normative orientation toward the phenomenon and the "feeling rules" which contribute to one's labeling of feeling states. The subjective nature of the feeling of jealousy not only makes it difficult for researchers to record its existence, saliency, potency and type, but it may be problematic even, for subjects themselves to identify and characterize this emotional experience. Depending on one's normatively internalized orientation toward jealousy in marriage, those emotional cognates of jealousy described above in our model may, in fact, be redefined or even denied when experienced by the actor. However, this issue is not peculiar to the study of jealousy per se, but is a common research problem in the sociology of emotions.

Initially, the concept of jealousy needs specification both definitionally and operationally in empirical research efforts. Following the earlier discussion regarding multidimensionality, it is important that the "jealousy" under study be delineated in terms of type (What/Who is the object?), nature of the threat (Whose resources, and what resources, are threatened?), and the nature of the anticipated reaction to the threat (which could be predicted from our model or a similar one). Taking these considerations into account, traditional questionnaire approaches to the study of jealousy may be problematic in obtaining the desired level of specificity.

Perhaps indepth interviews would be one alternative strategy for exploring the situational context that caused the arousal of the emotion and its behavioral consequences. In this sense, it might be possible to not only address the above mentioned questions, but it might also allow for the distinguishing of imbalances of power from imbalances of esteem and the subjects' attribution of agent. In addition, simulation and gaming strategies may appropriately allow for the observation of negotiation and conflict resolution techniques on jealousy-related issues.

The utilization of Hothschild's (1975) discussion of alternative approaches to the sociology of emotion might be beneficial also. A distinction could be made between an attribution approach and a cultural labeling approach for the study of emotions. An attribution approach might focus on actors' ideas about the causes of behavior, both their own behavior and others, and particularly a focus on the motives attributed to self and others would shed light on the dynamics of the situational contexts of jealousy. The use of scenarios (e.g., Veerhusen and Krain, 1980) and alternative projective techniques would, hopefully, allow us to tap into these processes.

The cultural labeling approach would possibly allow us to either: (1) hold the experience constant and examine variations in labeling (For instance, the differential labeling of jealousy by male and females could be examined by using scenarios and asking subjects of both genders to describe how the actors feel); or, (2) holding the labels constant and examining variations in experience; or (3) looking at the interrelationship between experience and labeling by holding neither constant and examining the degree to which subjects discriminate between the two.

At any rate, it certainly appears obvious that the interpersonal style and exchange dynamics of the marital dyad are, for most couples, regulated in part by the existence or potential existence of jealousy for one of both spouses. However, to date, little effort has been given to systematically assessing the determinants and consequences of marital jealousy as it affects marital, familial and extra-familial expectations, interactions, and behavior. This paper, then, has been a preliminary attempt to rectify that omission by providing a conceptual/theoretical perspective on jealousy dynamics in marriage.

FIGURE 1. KEMPER'S (1978) MODEL OF
RELATIONAL DIMENSIONS AND ATTRIBUTED AGENT

	POWER		STATUS
FELT EXCESS	Self / Other	I	II
FELT DEFICIT	Self / Other	III	IV

FIGURE 2. RELATIONAL DIMENSIONS, ATTRIBUTED AGENT,
AND EMOTIONAL COGNATES OF JEALOUSY*

	POWER		ESTEEM
Agent: <u>Self</u> EXCESS	Guilt / Blame	I	II
Agent: <u>Other</u>			Shame / Resentment
Agent: <u>Self</u> DEFICIT	Anxiety / Rebellion	III	IV
Agent: <u>Other</u>			Depression / Hostility

*The matrix represents a modification of Kemper's (1978) model toward the analysis of jealousy in marriage.

REFERENCES

- Averill, James M.
1976 "Emotion and anxiety." Pp. 87-130 in Marvin Zuckerman and Charles D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Emotions and Anxiety*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Bernard, Jessie
1977 "Jealousy and marriage." Pp. 141-150 in Gordon Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Blau, Peter
1964 *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Borgatta, Edgar F.
1964 "The structure of personality characteristics." *Behavioral Science* 9:8-17.
- Broderick, Carlfred
1971 "Beyond the five conceptual frameworks: A decade of development in family theory." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33 (February):139-159.
- Chadwick-Jones, J.
1976 *Social Exchange Theory: Its Structure and Influence in Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clanton, Gordon, and Lynn G. Smith
1977 *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cook, Karen
1975 "Expectations, evaluations and equity." *American Sociological Review* 40 (June):372-388.
- Darwin, Charles
1888 *Descent of Man*. Vol. 2. London.
- Davis, Kingsley
1936 "Jealousy and sexual property." *Social Forces* 14 (March): 395-405.
- Edwards, John
1969 "Familial behavior as social exchange." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31 (August):518-526.
- Ekeh, Peter
1974 *Social Exchange Theory: The Two Traditions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ellis, Albert

- 1977 "Rational and irrational jealousy." Pp. 170-179 in Gordon Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Emerson, Richard

- 1976 "Social exchange theory." Pp. 335-362 in A. Inkeles, J. Coleman and N. Smelser (Eds.), *Annual Review of Sociology*. Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Foster, George M.

- 1972 "The anatomy of envy: A study in symbolic behavior." *Current Anthropology* 13 (April):165-186.

Gergen, Kenneth J.

- 1980 *Social Exchange: Advances in theory and Research*. New York, N. Y.: Plenum Publishing Corporation.

Ho, David Yau-fai

- 1976 "On the concept of face." *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (January):867-884.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell

- 1975 "The sociology of feeling and emotion: Selected possibilities." Pp. 280-307 in Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Kanter (Eds.), *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science*. New York: Anchor Books.

Homans, George

- 1958 "Social behavior as exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (May):597-606.
- 1961 *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Kemper, Theodore D.

- 1973 "The fundamental dimensions of social relationship: A theoretical statement." *Acta Sociologica* 16:41-58.
- 1978a *A Social Interactional Theory of Emotions*. New York: Wiley.
- 1978b "Toward a sociology of emotions: Some problems and some solutions." *The American Sociologist* 13 (February):30-40.

Lobsenz, Norman M.

- 1977 "Taming the green-eyed monster." Pp. 26-34 in Gordon Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:

Lorr, Maurice and Douglas M. McNair

- 1963 "An interpersonal behavior circle." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67:69-75.

May, Rollo

- 1972 Power and Innocence: A Search for the Sources of Violence.
New York: W. W. Norton.

Mazur, Ronald

- 1977 "Beyond jealousy and possessiveness." Pp. 181-187 in Gordon
Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs,
N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

McDonald, Gerald W.

- 1978 "A structural theory of social exchange: Implications for
family theory and research." Presented at the annual meeting
of the American Sociological Association in San Francisco,
September.

Mead, Margaret

- 1977 "Jealousy: Primitive and civilized." Pp. 115-127 in Gordon
Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.) Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs,
N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Murstein, Bernard

- 1973 "A theory of marital choice applying to interracial marriage."
Pp. 17-35 in J. Stuart and L. Abt (Eds.), Interracial Marriage.
New York: Grossman.

Nye, F. Ivan

- 1978 "Is choice and exchange theory the key?" Journal of Marriage
and the Family 40 (May):219-233.

O'Neill, Nena and George O'Neill

- 1972 Open Marriage: A New Lifestyle for Couples. New York:
M. Evans.

Scanzoni, John

- 1972 Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in the American Marriage.
Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- 1979 "Social processes and power in families." Pp. 295-316 in
W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye and I. Reiss (Eds.) Contemporary
Theories About the Family: Research-Based Theories, Volume 1.
New York: The Free Press.

Schachter, Stanley

- 1964 "The interaction of cognitive and physiological determinants
of emotional state." Pp. 49-80 in Leonard Berkowitz (Ed.),
Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 1, New York:
Academic Press.

Schoeck, Helmut

- 1969 Envy: A Theory of Social Behaviour. New York: Harcourt,
Brace and World, Inc.

- Schott, Susan
1979 "The sociology of emotion: Some starting points." Pp. 450-462
in Scott G. McNall (Ed.), Theoretical Perspectives in Sociology.
New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Schutz, William C.
1958 FIRO: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Simpson, Richard
1972 "Theories of social exchange." A Sociology Module. New York:
General Learning Press.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack
1953 The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Thibaut, J., and H. Kelley
1959 The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley.
- Walster, Elaine, and G. William Walster
1977 "The social psychology of jealousy." Pp. 91-99 in Gordon
Clanton and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs,
N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Westermarck, Edward A.
1922 The History of Human Marriage. 5th Edition. New York:
Macmillan.
- Whitehurst, Robert N.
1977 "Jealousy and American values." Pp. 136-139 in Gordon Clanton
and Lynn G. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:
Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Veerhusen, Deborah, and Mark Krain
1980 "The green eyed monster: Jealousy in dating relationships."
Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological
Society in Milwaukee, April.